

CONFIDENTIAL

OCI-8554

Approved For Release 2000/08/29 : CIA-RDP79S01057A000400010026-7

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : Assistant Director, Current Intelligence

DATE: 19 July 1954

FROM : [REDACTED] 25X1A

DOCUMENT NO. 18
 NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒
☐ DECLASSIFIED
 CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C
 NEXT REVIEW DATE: _____
 AUTH: HR 70-2
 DATE: 3 APR 1980 REVIEWER: 018645

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Purported Diary of Maxim Litvinov

1. Friday, 16 July 1954, [REDACTED] examined a manuscript purporting to be a translation of a diary of Maxim Litvinov. This purported diary was examined at the home [REDACTED]

25X1A

STATOTHR

STATOTHR

2. The purported diary will shortly be published by Andre Dentsch, in England. The manuscript has been examined by E. H. Carr, and he has prepared a twenty page foreword for the book. Mr. Carr's evaluation is that the earlier portions of the diary appear to be partly genuine -- i.e., that there was a diary, but this diary has been embroidered and elaborated upon. Mr. Carr views the later portions of the diary as spurious. Mr. Carr admits the impossibility of separating the fact from fiction, and ends up with the note that, in any event, "even as historical romance" the document is still an important contribution to Soviet studies.

3. According to Carr, the purported diary was dictated by Litvinov on various occasions when he was abroad from the twenties up to the time of his permanent return to the USSR in 1943. Litvinov allegedly left these notes in the safekeeping of Madame Kollontai, a Soviet Ambassador. After Litvinov's permanent return to the USSR in 1943, he continued, on occasion, to make his notes, and had Madame Kollontai carry these notes out of the USSR for safekeeping. Madame Kollontai was recalled from the West in 1945, never again to leave to USSR, and it is worth noting that the purported diary contains several long items dated 1946 and 1950.

4. In preliminary, it must be noted that the circumstances surrounding the document are characteristic of a fabrication. The document came to light in Russian emigre circles in Western Europe; particulars relating to the document have been handled by written answers to questions posed by Carr; Carr was unable to interview any of the living principals of the case; the original Russian text is apparently not available, and a photostat of a few pages of the journal was all that was forthcoming at the request of the American publishing house (Lippincott).

5. E. H. Carr noted that the document appeared to be of composite authorship. I believe, however, that close textual analysis would reveal not two but at least three, and possibly more, different authors. This impression derives from many numerous stylistic indications, in such matters as the manner in which names and titles were handled. The consistency of usage within a given section of the document, and variations between sections, in matters regarding which one would not expect Litvinov to change his habits almost certainly indicates forgery.

CONFIDENTIAL

Approved For Release 2000/08/29 : CIA-RDP79S01057A000400010026-7

6. There are also several certain and probable errors in the later portions of the document, and several gross improbabilities, which speak against it.

7. The evaluation problem thus reduces itself, for all practical purposes, to discussion of the authenticity of the earlier portions of the purported diary. In my opinion, this section, as the balance of the paper, is fabricated.

8. This opinion is based on:

a. The trivial nature of much of the material. Many little inconsequential details of this and that -- the account number of Gosbank in Chase National Bank -- etc.

b. Internal contradictions. These were evident chiefly in relation to Litvinov's attitude towards Stalin, and Litvinov's views on policy towards China.

c. Material improbabilities. None of these items are conclusive in any sense, but collectively they argue against the authenticity of the document. Principal items are:

- In 1926, Trotsky "suspected" Stalin. This is at best a gross understatement.

- Litvinov's efforts to bring about reconciliation between Trotsky and Stalin.

- Politburo was referred to exclusively as the "Instantsiga."

- Mao tse tung alleged to be in Moscow in 1926.

- Litvinov opposing the placement of Communists in Soviet missions abroad. Litvinov's resistance to assignments from the Party.

- Stalin quotes Schiller to Litvinov.

- Stalin discussing with Litvinov in 1926 or 1925 the necessity ultimately to execute all the Oppositionists. This is anachronistic and it is further improbable that Stalin would share such ideas with Litvinov.

d. Omission of things one would expect to see discussed. No reference to Zinoviev letter, to "Socialism in One Country" despite lengthy discussions of UK-USSR relations and of the Trotsky-Stalin feud.

e. The document simply does not sound as if it had been written by a Communist. This is necessarily a subjective judgement, and yet I regard it as the most important one. It does not have the "flavor" or "feel" of the genuine article. It leaves no such impression as, for example, Louis Fischer's Soviets in World Affairs does.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

9. It was therefore our conclusion that the document was fraudulent in its entirety. We point out the fact that research groups exist for the very purpose of producing such documents, usually with a commercial end in view.

10. We agree with Carr that the document does not seem to have been prepared for propaganda or psychological warfare purposes.

25X1A 11. [REDACTED] is preparing a separate report to go forward through DD/P channels.



Attachments (original only).

Autostat of E. H. Carr's foreword.

Autostat of five pages of Russian text.

25X1A

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~